

BOARD OF DESIGN REVIEW MINUTES

October 26, 2000

CALL TO ORDER: Chairman David Williams called the meeting to order at 6:34 p.m. in the Beaverton City Hall Council Chambers at 4755 SW Griffith Drive

ROLL CALL: Present were Chairman David Williams; Board Members Hal Beighley, Anissa Crane, and Stewart Straus. Board Members Monty Edberg and Walter Lemon III were excused.

Associate Planner Tyler Ryerson, Senior Planner John Osterberg and Recording Secretary Sandra Pearson represented staff.

VISITORS:

Chairman Williams read the format for the meeting and asked if any member of the audience wished to address the Board on any non-agenda item. There was no response.

NEW BUSINESS:

Chairman Williams opened the Public Hearing and read the format of the meeting. There were no disqualifications of Board Members. No one in the audience challenged the right of any Board Member to hear any agenda items or participate in the hearing or requested that the hearing be postponed to a later date. He asked if there were any ex parte contact, conflict of interest or disqualifications in any of the hearings on the agenda.

PUBLIC HEARING:

A. APP 2000-0014 -- BEAVERTON BI-MART REMODEL APPEAL

Appeal of the Planning Director's decision to deny BDR2000-0128, a request to modify the exterior of an approximately 43,380 square foot building. The proposal is to reduce the building area by approximately 490 square feet by removing the existing exterior bottle room and condensing unit room on the east side of the building. The applicant proposes to repair and update the architectural style of the existing façade by modifying the façade. This request to modify the building was reviewed administratively by the Facilities Review

Committee. The Committee found that the proposal did not meet all of the Design Review criteria required for approval. Subsequently, the Planning Director has denied the proposal submitted by the applicant. The site is located at 4750 SW Western Avenue, Washington County Assessor's Map 1S1-15AD on Tax Lot 200 and is zoned Community Service (CS). The parcel is approximately 3.32 acres in size.

Associate Planner Tyler Ryerson presented the Staff Report and described the appeal of a denial of the Design Review Type 2 application for modification to the exterior of an approximately 43,380 square foot building. He mentioned that the proposal is to locate a *Bi-Mart Store* in an existing *Walmart Grocery Store* facility. He discussed issues that have been addressed and resolved, including the three major elements of the appeal, including:

1. The building façade;
2. A sidewalk reconstruction; and
3. Site lighting.

Mr. Ryerson discussed the Condition of Approval regarding the sidewalks, noting that the applicant has brought to the attention of the staff a number of items that make this condition unnecessary, adding that staff is recommending elimination of Facilities Review Committee Conditions of Approval A-1, C-1 and C-2.

Mr. Ryerson discussed the issue of site lighting, observing that a lighting plan had not been submitted with the original application to allow the Facilities Review Committee an opportunity to determine if the site illumination is adequate to protect from criminal activities and accidents. He pointed out that the appeal is based upon a technical standard, adding that the same issue had been presented in the design standard criteria, although that particular item was not appealed, noting that staff still believes that it is necessary to review the proposed lighting.

Mr. Ryerson discussed what he considers the major issue of the appeal, the façade design, and provided the materials board and illustrations that had been provided by the applicant indicating both the existing and proposed conditions. He referred to the illustration, which includes approximately 750 square feet of actual glazing of the entrance and exit doors of the facade. He referred to the proposed *Bi-Mart* façade, depicting the colonnade and the cantilever element, noting that the height of the building would be raised to approximately 25 feet. He pointed out that the Facilities Review Committee's major concern is the applicant's proposal for the elimination of the windows that are already present. Observing that staff has attempted to work with the applicant to maintain the existing windows, he noted that staff had felt that it would be possible to actually utilize these windows in their design. He pointed out that they have also provided the applicant with the opportunity to provide other design alternatives, emphasizing that no alternatives have been submitted. Since no other proposals have been received, staff is recommending that the existing windows be retained. He emphasized the

necessity of designing a façade that is compatible in relationship to the other buildings in the neighborhood.

Mr. Ryerson provided visual illustrations on the overhead projector depicting recent structures approved by Board of Design Review regulations and similar structures and uses, as follows: the existing *Walmart* façade; *KFC*, directly to the north of the site; *Round Table Pizza*, which abuts the building; *Bike and Hike*, with windows the entire length of the business, next to *Round Table Pizza*; across the street to the north a number of home improvement type of businesses and furniture stores; *Wallpapers to Go*; *Furniture City*, to the north of Beaverton/Hillsdale Highway, across from property; to the west, *Parker Furniture*; *The Salvation Army Thrift Store*; the *Kaiser Building*; to the south a former *Fred Meyer* converted to multi-tenants; center view of the eastern side of the building; recent façade change *Papa John's Pizza* with windows, awnings, wainscots and colors; *Best Buy* at the *Beaverton Mall* replacing a *Future Shop*; Walker Rd & Cedar Hills *Rite Aid*; *Pep Boys*; *Jamba Juice* at the *Beaverton Mall*; a medical clinic; *Michael's Crafts*, converted from a grocery store; *Mill End Store* with a canopy addition and glazing; *Borders Book Store*, converted from a former grocery store; and *Office Depot*, converted from a former grocery store.

Mr. Ryerson advised the members of the Board of Design Review that staff recommends denial of APP 2000-0014, adding that staff also recommends an alternate recommendation for approval of BDR 2000-0128, with conditions. Because the applicant has submitted no alternate plans for the storefront windows, staff recommends, as a Condition of Approval, that these storefront windows not be removed. He noted that staff also recommends adoption of the Facilities Review Committee Conditions of Approval dated September 6, 2000, eliminating Condition Nos. A-2, C-1 and C-2. Concluding, he offered to respond to any questions or comments.

Mr. Straus observed that he is glad to see that the sidewalk issue has been resolved. He questioned whether there are any stated requirements for the Community Service (CS) zoning that provides that a certain percentage of a building façade must include windows.

Mr. Ryerson advised Mr. Straus that no specific condition exists providing that a certain percentage of a building façade must include windows. He agreed that the building designs he had illustrated included windows for purposes other than a specific condition, adding that some of these structures are converted from other uses.

Mr. Straus observed that at the time these structures were converted, those responsible most likely were not obligated by a code and had a choice of removing or leaving the windows. He referred to the wide variety of examples and uses, noting that some tenants utilize windows for display purposes and that some restaurants utilize windows for customers who prefer to feel connected with

the rest of the world while eating. He discussed the relationship of the interior use of a building and whether windows are appropriate or inappropriate for a particular use.

Mr. Ryerson advised Mr. Straus that staff and the Facilities Review Committee had not specified that the windows had to remain, emphasizing that the applicant had been requested and failed to provide alternative designs for the purpose of reviewing the designs and colors.

Mr. Straus questioned the purpose of requesting alternative designs, rather than retaining the windows.

Mr. Ryerson referred to the materials board, described the materials, façade and color scheme.

Mr. Straus requested clarification of whether staff was attempting to include features, not necessarily windows, to provide additional definition to the structure.

Mr. Ryerson agreed that staff would like the structure to provide more articulation.

Mr. Straus observed that while the windows are not actually necessary, the building needs pizzazz, emphasizing that such design issues belong in the province of the Board of Design Review, rather than the Facilities Review Committee.

APPLICANT:

JIM SPICKERMAN, representing *Bi-Mart Corporation*, observed that he had prepared the appeal, adding that the applicant had attempted to resolve the issues with staff, who were insistent upon all of the conditions initially imposed by the Facilities Review Committee and the Planning Director. He pointed out that some of the issues of concern have been modified, eliminated or addressed. He discussed the issue regarding the sidewalk on SW Western Avenue, observing that it had not been feasible for the City of Beaverton to insist upon improvements to the sidewalk. He expressed his opinion that the change from *Walmart* to *Bi-Mart* is a drastic change of occupancy, noting that the applicant is removing some obnoxious-looking features from the back of the building, as well as making a great deal of improvements to the front of the building. He commented that the existing windows in the *Walmart* building are unattractive, adding that while a view of the lighted ceiling is visible from outside, the actual purpose of these windows is not apparent.

Mr. Spickerman referred to the issue of the façade, specifically a Condition of Approval providing that the old windows be retained, emphasizing that the language regarding architectural features provides, as follows: "...in relationship

to existing surroundings in the future allowed uses, the location, size, shape, height, spatial and visual arrangement of the uses and structures are compatible." He pointed out that this does not involve the spatial, height and visual relationship of uses and structures and expressed his opinion that there is no authority to impose these conditions.

CHRIS SHELBY, representing *RAR Architects*, provided visual illustrations on the overhead projector depicting the windows in question, many of which have been blacked out, leaving a view of only the ceiling and light fixture. He pointed out that the existing single-pane windows do not meet the existing Energy Code. He provided a view of the side of the *Salvation Army Thrift Store*. He mentioned the *Kaiser Building*, which is directly across from the site. He indicated a former *Best Store*, which has been converted into an Asian Market, noting that they have added a canopy, a single entry with single main feature, with no windows whatsoever on the face of the building. He pointed out that a restaurant without windows is also located within the store. He discussed the *Target Store*, *Montgomery Ward's* and the *Fred Meyer Store* facing the Beaverton/Hillsdale Highway across from City Hall. He mentioned *Natures Northwest* and discussed the conversion of a flex space retail area, describing the glass entry door with glass on either side and the single exit point with double exit door similar to what has been proposed. He mentioned *Bi-Mart's* business philosophy and ideology, emphasizing that windows disrupt their way of business and their approach to customer service and sales.

SCOTT REITER, *RAR Architects*, provided illustrations of alternate proposals that had been prepared but never formally submitted to staff. He discussed a proposed screen wall at the façade elevation, noting that this wall would resemble a windscreen, adding that this had been derived from staff's heavy emphasis on glass. He discussed another option to change from a flat canopy system to a roofed canopy system, noting that a metal roof would provide a stronger emphasis on color.

Mr. Straus questioned the color proposed for the metal roof.

Mr. Reiter advised Mr. Straus that *Bi-Mart* traditionally utilizes two main colors, one of which is a very deep red, adding that the other is a forest green.

Observing that the Police Department is conducting canine training and citizen involvement in the adjoining room, Chairman Williams advised those attending this meeting not to become alarmed if they notice any unusual noises.

Mr. Reiter expressed his opinion that the applicant's proposal would provide a significant enhancement from what is there at this time, adding that the structure is tired and needs to be improved.

Mr. Straus pointed out that it is not fair to judge by what is occurring in the rest of the neighborhood, and questioned whether staff has had the opportunity to review these two options.

Mr. Reiter observed that although these options have been discussed with staff, no formal proposal had been submitted. On question, he advised Ms. Crane that the color of the *Bi-Mart* logo is red.

Chairman Williams referred to a small piece of white brick on the materials board, requesting clarification of whether the applicant had included this because they were unable to provide a small piece of CMU.

Mr. Reiter advised Chairman Williams that a piece of CMU that small is difficult to obtain.

Chairman Williams emphasized that not everyone would be aware of the intent in replacing the CMU with brick on the materials board, and requested clarification of whether Mr. Reiter prefers Option A or Option B.

Observing that both options have merits, Mr. Reiter indicated that he has a preference for Option B, which provides more of a variety on the building appearance.

Mr. Ryerson discussed alternatives that had been mentioned at the last meeting, observing that the applicant had decided to appeal the decision to the Board of Design Review, rather than take advantage of the opportunity to provide the alternative plans to staff. He expressed concern with obtaining samples of the colors and materials, the types and colors of glass, and the metal roofing.

Mr. Straus questioned whether sufficient definition of these colors and materials could be included in the Conditions of Approval.

Mr. Ryerson advised Mr. Straus that including these details in the record would be sufficient to satisfy his concerns.

Mr. Reiter advised the Board that he would like to have the opportunity to discuss this with the *Bi-Mart* management, observing that while the proposed trim color is red, the only other option would be green. After conferring with the representative from *Bi-Mart*, he indicated that the applicant proposes what he described as a forest or hunter green roof and flashing, adding that the sign would still be red.

DENNIS STAHL, representing *Bi-Mart Corporation*, described stores recently built in Madras and Corvallis, expressing his opinion that this particular type of green-colored metal roofing provides a good contrast with the red trim and signage.

On question, Mr. Reiter assured Chairman Williams that the applicant would leave the exhibit for the record.

Mr. Spickerman discussed the lighting issue, expressing concern that the condition pertaining to the lighting should provide, as follows: "...in order to determine if the site is adequately illuminated to protect from crime and accidents and that the lighting will not adversely affect the abutting properties, the applicant shall submit a lighting plan for Facilities Review approval." He emphasized that the applicant is not opposed to submitting a lighting plan, adding that they do not wish to adhere to some standard that is not applicable. On question, he advised Mr. Straus that this particular Condition of Approval is located on page 10 of the Facilities Review.

Mr. Ryerson noted that this is Condition No. A-4.

Mr. Spickerman expressed appreciation of efforts to resolve this issue this evening.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY:

On question, no member of the audience appeared to testify at this time.

On question, Mr. Ryerson indicated that staff had no further comments at this time.

The public portion of the Public Hearing was closed.

Mr. Straus **MOVED** and Mr. Beighley **SECONDED** a motion for the approval of APP 2000-0014 -- Beaverton Bi-Mart Remodel Appeal, based upon the testimony, reports and exhibits presented during the public hearing on the matter and upon the background facts, findings and conclusions found in the Staff Report dated October 26, 2000, subject to the following conditions and modifications:

1. The adopted Facilities Review Committee Conditions of Approval dated September 6, 2000 are hereby made a part of this approval with the following revisions:
 - a. Condition A.2 from the September 6, 2000 Facilities Review Committee Conditions of Approval shall be removed.
 - b. Condition C.1 from the September 6, 2000 Facilities Review Committee Conditions of Approval shall be removed.

- c. Condition C.2 from the September 6, 2000 Facilities Review Committee Conditions of Approval shall be removed.
 - d. Condition A.4 from the September 6, 2000 Facilities Review Committee Conditions of Approval shall be removed.
- 2. The adopted Conditions of Approval of BDR 2000-0128, dated October 3, 2000, are hereby made a part of this approval.

Motion **CARRIED**, unanimously.

Mr. Straus **MOVED** and Ms. Crane **SECONDED** a motion for the approval of BDR 2000-0128, based upon the testimony, reports and exhibits presented during the public hearing on the matter and upon the background facts, findings and conclusions found in the Staff Report dated October 3, 2000, including Conditions of Approval Nos. 1 through 18, subject to the following conditions and modifications:

- 18. The Facilities Review Committee Conditions of Approval, dated September 6, 2000, are hereby made a part of this approval only if the Design Review application is ultimately approved, with the following revisions, as approved by APP 2000-0014:
 - a. Condition A.2 from the September 6, 2000 Facilities Review Committee Conditions of Approval shall be removed.
 - b. Condition C.1 from the September 6, 2000 Facilities Review Committee Conditions of Approval shall be removed.
 - c. Condition C.2 from the September 6, 2000 Facilities Review Committee Conditions of Approval shall be removed.
 - a. Condition A.4 from the September 6, 2000 Facilities Review Committee Conditions of Approval shall be removed.
- 19. The front elevation of the building shall be modified in accordance with applicant's proposed elevation "B", except for glazed windscreen, which shall not be required, but with painted wall area in the three bays surrounding the entrance and exit in a color of a deeper tone than the

typical wall color. Color for the standing seam metal roof and for other metal trims shall be applicant's standard green.

Motion **CARRIED**, unanimously.

MISCELLANEOUS BUSINESS:

The meeting adjourned at 7:45 p.m.